

JDA Registry

File

*Security 4*

16 September 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Communications  
Director of Data Processing  
Director of Finance  
Director of Logistics  
Director of Medical Services  
Director of Personnel  
Director of Security  
Director of Training

FROM : John F. Blake  
Deputy Director for Administration

Gentlemen:

Attached is a copy of an article entitled "Where Have All the Leaders Gone?" which was published by the Federeal Executive Institute in June 1975. I thoroughly enjoyed reading the article and I believe you also will take pleasure from it.

John F. Blake

Att

Distribution:

Orig - D/OC

cc - D/DP

- D/OF

- D/OL

- D/OMS

- D/OP

- D/OS

- D/OTR

~~1~~ - DDA Subject w/att

1 - DDA Chrono w/att

1 - JFB Chrono w/o att

DDA:JFBlake:der (16 September 1976)

## Where Have All the Leaders Gone?

Warren G. Bennis

"Where have all the leaders gone?" They are, as a paraphrase of that haunting song could remind us, "long time past."

All the leaders whom the young respect are dead. F.D.R., who could challenge a nation to rise above fear, is gone. Churchill, who could demand and get blood, sweat and tears, is gone. Schweitzer, who from the jungles of Lambarene could inspire mankind with reverence for life, is gone. Einstein, who could give us that sense of unity in infinity, of cosmic harmony, is gone. Gandhi, the Kennedys, Martin Luther King, all lie slain, as if to prove the mortal risk in telling us that we can be greater, better than we are.

The landscape is littered with fallen leaders. A President re-elected with the greatest plurality in history resigns in disgrace. The Vice-President he twice chose as qualified to succeed him is driven from office as a common crook. Since 1973 the governments of all nine common market countries have changed hands. In the last nine months more major governments have fallen. Shaky conditions exist in Finland, Belgium and Israel. Minority governments rule precariously in Britain, Denmark and Sweden. In Ethiopia the King of Kings is captive in his palace.

Where have all the leaders gone?

Those who remain -- the successors, the survivors -- the Fords and Rockefellers who come to power without election, the struggling corporate chieftains, the university presidents, the city managers, the state governors -- all leaders today now are seen as an endangered species, because of the whirl of events and circumstances beyond rational control.

There is a high turnover, an appalling mortality -- whether occupational or actuarial -- among leaders. In recent years the typical college president has lasted about four years. Men capable of leading institutions often refuse to accept such pressures, such risks. President Ford has had great difficulty getting the top men he wanted to accept Cabinet jobs. We see what James Reston of The New York Times calls "burnt out cases," the debris of leaders. We see Peter Principle leaders rising to their final levels of incompetency. It has been said if a Martian were to demand, "Take me to your leader," Earthlings would not know where to take him. Administrative sclerosis around the world, in political office, in all administrative offices, breeds suspicion and distrust. A bumper sticker in Massachusetts summed it up: "Impeach Someone!"

We see people dropping out, not just college students, but leaders of large institutions, businesses, to seek some Walden utopia without responsibility. We see more and more managers turning into Swiss gnomes who do not lead but attempt to barely manage.

A scientist at the University of Michigan has recently discussed what he considers to be the ten basic dangers to our society. First in his list of ten, the most significant, was the possibility of some kind of nuclear war or accident which would destroy the entire human race. The second basic challenge facing us is the prospect of a worldwide epidemic, disease, famine or depression. His third in terms of the key problems which can bring about the destruction of society is the quality of the management and leadership of our institutions.

I think he's right, and here we are: virtually without leaders. In the last year or so, we've seen four senior Congressional leaders, Committee chairmen, deposed. In the new Congress, the new junior members have the power. Whether they will exercise it intelligently and responsibly is another question. The Congress used to get much more work done when there were some towering

giants in those chambers -- Rayburn, C. were arrogant, so managed to produce there is scant after horizon of American

In business, also, in mind, the Fords, Sloans, Ketterings, really "outside" the widespread acceptance. Gerald Ford seems presidents of major it were). Max Ways about the absence Hall of Fame. Of are business leader Mark Hopkins, Neil Alice Freeman and others.

But these giants were a growing invisible Haverford College about these vanished administrators off on educational affairs there now a college be President of the

What about our city of Cincinnati managers in the International City March 1 after just

giants in those chambers, the "whales," as Lyndon Johnson called them -- Rayburn, George, Vandenberg, Johnson himself. They were arrogant, sometimes oppressive, but nevertheless they managed to produce an aura that things were getting done. Now there is scant attention to the basic issues of our times. The horizon of American politics is peculiarly flat, and characterless.

In business, also, the landscape is flat. The names that come to mind, the Fords, Edisons, Rockefellers, Morgans, Schwabs, Sloans, Ketterings, are gone. Nixon's business intimates were really "outside" the business establishment, entrepreneurs without widespread acceptance as leaders or spokesmen. And President Gerald Ford seems to get on best with the Washington vice presidents of major corporations (a vice-president syndrome as it were). Max Ways in a recent issue of Fortune magazine talks about the absence of business leaders in New York University's Hall of Fame. Of the ninety-nine individuals selected, only ten are business leaders. Educators are more highly represented -- Mark Hopkins, Nicholas Murray Butler, Mary Lyon, Horace Mann, Alice Freeman Palmer, Robert Hutchins, Booker T. Washington, and others.

But these giants were of old. Today we see what appears to be a growing invisibility and blandness of education leaders. Haverford College President Jack Coleman writes nostalgically about these vanished leaders: "Gone are the days when academic administrators offered leadership on a broad scale, whether it was on educational affairs or pressing public matters of the day." Is there now a college president who might, like Wilson, aspire to be President of the United States?

What about our cities, their management and leadership? My own city of Cincinnati, having hired one of the outstanding city managers in the nation, Bob Turner, a former President of the International City Management Association, saw him leave on March 1 after just three years on the job -- unable to realize

the goals that he brought with him. (He is becoming a corporate executive, hoping for greater scope.) And in Detroit the first Black mayor, Coleman Young, said to a jubilant crowd at his inauguration, "As of this moment, we're going to turn this city around." Less than a year later, Coleman Young in his "State of the City" address confessed that he has not been able to realize any of his goals, including the reduction of crime and the revitalization of industry in Detroit. It is as if the problems that people in leadership face are out of control. There was a different time, when Carlisle could write about institutions as being the lengthened shadow of one man. And there was Pope Urban IV, whose retinue would greet him with a chant, "*deus es, deus es*," to which he could reply, "It is somewhat strong, but really very pleasant." Leaders do not hear those chants today. They have very few moments for hearing something adulatory, or merely pleasant.

A student at my university wrote me a letter after a talk he had heard me give. "Where," he asked, "is education to go in a society that becomes more and more dreamless each day?"

What shall I reply? What has dulled the image, not only of society but of its leaders? We hunger for greatness but what we find are, at best, efficient managers, or at worst, amoral gnomes, lost in narrow orbits.

Why have we become a dreamless society? In the case of educational leaders, Haverford's Jack Coleman suggests that we have fallen into a "popularity trap." "We have asked too soon and too often whether our immediate constituents would like our programs and policies. Like other leaders of the day, we read polls."

It wasn't always that way. Not long ago a relative of the venerable M. Cary Thomas was describing that woman's presidential years at Bryn Mawr College. An eager undergraduate asked, "Was she

liked?" The  
crossed her

Harry McPh  
has some too  
over-exposed  
their whole  
quickly."  
various lead  
perceived as

Are leaders

I have spec  
rational, the  
leadership,  
other insti  
the Nation  
reflect in  
look back

I can compar  
be done wit  
compare wit  
leader of ac  
knows from  
omnipotent  
bewildered,  
stirrups.

That is so  
solutions, o  
innumerable  
goals and de  
leader today  
then devise  
potentially n

liked?" The answer was short: "I'm sure the question never crossed her mind."

Harry McPherson, a former counsel to President Lyndon Johnson, has some trenchant observations on leaders: "First, the media have over-exposed public men, showing their feet and in some cases their whole bodies of clay. Television burns up new personalities quickly." "Two, political, economic and social changes which various leaders offered as remedies for the Nation's ills are perceived as having failed or only partially succeeded."

Are leaders an endangered species?

I have spent most of my life in studying the best, the most rational, the most productive forms of organization and of leadership, whether of corporate, governmental, educational, or other institutions. In what is now my fourth year of governing the Nation's second largest urban multiversity -- whose problems reflect in microcosm those of any complex organization -- I can look back upon both accomplishments and failures.

I can compare what a specialist, a theorist, blithely believed should be done with what, in an imperfect world, can be done. I can compare what is desirable with what is possible. I know, as any leader of any organization -- public, corporate, institutional -- knows from experience, that the challenge is not for an omnipotent, omniscient "man on a white horse" but for a fallible, bewildered, often impotent individual to get one foot in the stirrups.

That is so because he confronts problems which may have no solutions, or at best only proximate solutions. He confronts innumerable, diverse and warring constituencies, whose separate goals and drives may be irreconcilable. The test, then, for any leader today is first to discover just what he does confront, and then devise the best, the optimum, ways of making that reality potentially manageable.

Let me first try to set forth the conflicting demands -- the turbulent environment -- which make that task so difficult.

Foremost is the loss of autonomy. Time was the leader could decide -- period. A Henry Ford, a Carnegie, could issue a ukase -- and all would automatically obey. Their successors' hands are now tied in innumerable ways -- by governmental requirements, by union rules, by the moral, and sometimes legal, pressures of organized consumers and environmentalists. As a supposed leader, I watch with envy the superior autonomy of the man mowing the university lawn, in complete control of the machine he rides, the total arbiter of which swath to cut where and when. I cannot match it.

The greatest problem facing institutions is the concatenation of external forces that impinge and impose upon it events outside the skin boundary of an organization. Fifty years ago this external environment was fairly placid, like an ocean on a calm day, forecastable, predictable, regular, not terribly eventful. Now that ocean is turbulent and highly interdependent and pivotal. In my own institution right now the key people for me to reckon with are not only the students, the faculty or my own management group, but people external to the university -- the city manager, city council members, the state legislature, the federal government, alumni and parents. There is an incessant, dissonant clamor out there. And because the university is a brilliant example of an institution that has blunted and diffused its main purposes -- through a proliferation of dependence on external patronage structures -- its autonomy has declined to the point where our boundary system is like Swiss cheese. Because of these pressures, every leader must create, in effect, a department of "external affairs," a secretary of state, as it were, to deal with external constituencies.

At the same time, our real Secretary of State, Kissinger, finds foreign affairs thwarted by internal constituencies which undo his long, laborious and precarious negotiations.

With this comes burners of the crown of thorns constituencies. Organized pressure all organizations have Black organizations -- surprisingly enough -- a Jewish faculty interests groups. was Lyndon Johnson together," at a to be together, of politics in which on particular basis

We have become more and more previously might injured in his special formal suit. My Black, for her to she could fill. An article. In New state senators to of the 29th member caucus (they did to the press). In has just ruled suspended, discipline -- that the loss property. A federal to each of the to whom it found had questioning the n is clear that the



With this comes a new movement of populism -- not the barn burners of the Grange days, not the free silver of Bryanism ("the crown of thorns"), but the fragmentation, the caucusization, of constituencies. On our campus, for example, we have innumerable organized pressure groups -- and these exist, more or less, for all organizations. We have women's lib, we have "gay lib," we have Black organizations for both students and faculty, we have -- surprisingly enough at a time when Jews enjoy great acceptance -- a Jewish faculty caucus. We have over 500 governance and interests groups. There is a loss of consensus, of community. It was Lyndon Johnson's tragedy to plead, "Come, let us reason together," at a time when all these fragments scarcely wanted to be together, much less reason together. We have a new form of politics in which people do not march on cities but march on particular bureaus or departments within our institutions.

We have become a litigious society, where individuals and groups more and more resort to the courts to determine issues which previously might have been settled privately. A hockey player, injured in his sport, bypasses the institutional procedures to bring formal suit. My own university faces a suit from a woman, a Black, for her loss of the administrative position I had thought she could fill. A law review has even been sued for rejecting an article. In New Jersey, a federal judge has ordered twenty-eight state senators to stand trial for violating the constitutional rights of the 29th member, a woman, by excluding her from their party caucus (they did so because she was "leaking" their deliberations to the press). In a Columbus test case, the U. S. Supreme Court has just ruled that secondary school students may not be suspended, disciplinarily, without formal charges and a hearing -- that the loss of a single day's education is a deprivation of property. A federal court in Washington has just awarded \$10,000 to each of the thousands of May, 1970, anti-war demonstrators whom it found had been illegally arrested and confined. Without questioning the merits of any particular case, the overriding fact is clear that the hands of all administrators are increasingly tied



by real or potential legal issues. I find I must consult our lawyers over even small, trivial decisions.

With the neopopulism comes a phenomenon which I have described as "arribismo," a term I heard in Peru. When the French say "arrivisme," or the Italians "arrivismo," both mean "pushiness." But "arribismo" means something more. It means, as the Marines jocularly used to define Semper Fi, "You've got yours, Jack, now I'll get mine." The U. S. arribismo distinguishes all those Americans of different groups trying to find their identities along race lines, sex lines, ethnic lines, even age lines - all at different stages of their social identity and their economic and political power.

And with the arribismo, the neopopulism is a related thing that one might call the "psychology of entitlement," the right to have things that one might not deserve from merit, or achievement, but simply because one's whole group has been deprived - by racism or whatever - from normal enjoyments. It demands X number of jobs regardless of the individual's personal qualifications.

All these pressure groups are not united but fragmented. They go their separate and often conflicting ways. They tell us that the old dream of the melting pot, of assimilation, does not work. They have never been "beyond the melting pot" (as Moynihan and Glazer saw it); they have been behind it. And they say, "Nuts to the work ethic, nuts to the American dream of hard work and you'll get ahead, become part of the mainstream of America." They say, "No, we don't want to be part of the mainstream - we just want to be us" - Blacks, homosexuals, Chicanos, women libbers, or Menominee Indians seizing an empty Catholic monastery.

We are trying to cope with the "Roosevelt legacy," the post-Depression development in the public sector of those areas

of welfare, was unwilling "Progress" semi-autonomous corporations, approximate of the individual is upon us. as if he were than many about the semi-governments, could scarcely our society, government. was 50 percent public and is

And, where self-employed bureaucracies might be sovereignty Juristic persons the same for

And along seen it have restrict or re. What we now being made to do with definitely out itself.

To take just Amendment n

42

How do we deal with it? Usually badly! By definition, a problem is something which persists and the tactics and strategies, usually not conscious policies, tend to at best put the problem or conflict under the rug. What we see often is a persistent tendency for leaders to surround themselves with yes men despite the fact that they will always say, "I don't want yes men." We find a tendency to emphasize loyalty and cooperation in a way that makes disagreement seem equivalent to disloyalty and rebellion if not sedition; a glossing over of serious differences in order to maintain a false appearance of harmony and teamwork; accepting ambiguous, mushy resolutions of differences which permit conflicting parties to arrive at dissimilar interpretations (actually they usually know better); or exploiting differences to strengthen one's personal position of influence to the weakening of the position of others.

There are various ways of coping with conflict. There is a choice -- one of the prime characteristics of a leader's role is to exercise choice. When leaders are ineffective it's often because they tend to reply in persistent, static ways to different problems. They tend to be repetitive rather than flexible. They are not exercising choice. Organizations have opportunities to exercise choice with regard to coping with conflict -- and making it a creative source of energy.

What I see most of all is avoidance, where conflict is denied. If conflict is denied, it is avoided. It sticks out at a consultant coming in. Avoidance sometimes is wise. There are times not to fight. There are times to keep conflict somewhat at bay. Along with avoidance but somewhat sterner is repression. (A parental version of this is, "We will not talk about that!") Repression of differences or conflict is punitive. It's saying that anybody who wants to face up to conflicts or differences will be punished, and we will certainly never reward the open expression of differences. People learn that. That's part of the culture again.

across the hall. It's true in every organization and institution. In fact, if it weren't true, I wouldn't believe that there could be an effective organization.

The problem is how do we contain the conflict (because it is inevitable), and how do we make it creative, useful - how do we really get those competitive energies into constructive and creative channels?

There are three reasons for the kinds of conflict that one sees most in organizations. The simplest is information. Y has information and A doesn't. It gets exciting when A and Y may have information which is diametrically opposite. This often happens. It's not that difficult to deal with informational discrepancies, although quite often that's the basis for what grows into a more virulent kind of a conflict.

Another factor is the perceptual apparatus -- the perceptions of people. When I was a consultant with the State Department, we did some interesting exercises trying to develop more understanding about the conflicts that existed between the administrative and the career ambassador types. One viewed the other as basically a cookie-pushing, pinstriped, Princeton, Ivy League type - "They can't start their car, how can they run an embassy?" And the ambassadorial types had probably a more benign contempt and a much more clever way of talking about the administrators, some of whom were very powerful men, some of whom had been heads of large corporations, but their way of talking about the "administrators" was that they were "car-pool supervisors." This gave you some idea of the perceptual differences that were not merely based on competition over scarce resources, backgrounds, ages. Where you are determines how you see things ("where you sit determines where you stand"). Our different roles are involved in the conflicts that exist in organizations.

40

fudging reality. The reason is that the norm of science has within it corrective mechanisms (replication of experiments). More important is the norm that a scientist reports data publicly.

It would be very easy to fake data. Recently there have been two cases where that was done. But it is remarkable how few there are, given the magnitude of the research going on. So for those who believe that we need a written ethical code, I want to disagree. A written ethical code can never be comprehensive enough or subtle enough to be a satisfactory guide to personal behavior. The answer to the ethical problems is in the very warp and woof of the institutional culture. It is those things that we tacitly allow and disallow. The leader can establish a new ethic by refusing to "go along" with the debasement of ethics.

The management of differences is important. That has to do with conflict and how we cope with conflict.

There are some areas in which the leader has to be the final arbiter. As a former organizational consultant, and now as one who presides over a large institution, I am convinced that how an organization deals with conflict is probably the best clue to its proper functioning. Organizations have different patterns, different mechanisms, of coping with conflict.

In a broad sense we look at, see, touch conflict almost every day. Talk to the head of a sales department in a major corporation about his attitudes toward (let's say) engineering or production. Talk to certain members of the staff about their perceptions of the line and vice versa. In some organizations intergroup conflict resembles a form of urban guerrilla warfare. The "others" are not even part of the species but are sort of a pseudo-species that exist in some funny other tribe which they would like to vanquish. In fact at times it seems as if the main objective is to destroy the competitors within the organization rather than the competitors without. The "enemy" is not across the street but

where contributions are prized, where independence and autonomy are encouraged. It isn't that just as an educator I am putting first encouraging the ability to learn. More than twenty years of research at the Institute of Social Research in Michigan, coordinated by Dr. Robert Kahn, has been trying to identify just what it is that gives one satisfaction in his or her job. They have concluded that it is above all the opportunity and capacity to learn. When that is no longer present, job satisfaction wavers and declines. The most progressive unions are aware of this -- they are now emphasizing those areas of the work life that have to do with learning, with the quality of the work, with the opportunities for advancement through education. So leaders have to be social architects to create those cultures and structures that facilitate these goals. Not just of the young -- the older have just been somewhat more reticent about expressing it.

A social architect must also deal with ethics. It's one of the prime ironies of our time that the heads of many corporations were prosecuted for the illegal political contributions they were black-jacked into giving by the former head of the very Justice Department now prosecuting them. The fact remains that if they had not long ago acquiesced in an illegal practice because "everybody else was doing it," they would not have found themselves in this moral dilemma. This also raises the question of responsibility of trustees and directors. I wonder whether the directors, particularly the outside directors, of these corporations knew about these illegal acts. If not, why not? That is a question that will and should be increasingly raised in the post-Watergate climate of corporate ethics. In an increasingly litigious society, directors can no longer be ignorant of what corporate officers do. The culture of an organization will dictate and govern its honesty and probity.

Consider the culture of science. Scientists are no more honest in their personal behavior than others. But it is interesting that there have been very few cases of scientists faking their data or

38

which he himself can have some part in creating and maintaining, or, contrary-wise, debilitating.

Social architecture is important because more and more people joining the work place are looking for careers, jobs, that not only make money but make sense and have meaning. More and more people are selecting jobs that will not only further their professional or career goals but will also give them a fuller life.

The latest nationwide survey by Yankelovich Associates, which I mentioned earlier, reveals that there is a blurring or diminishing of differences in the young, those aged 18 to 26, in their basic life styles, goals, career aspirations. The non-college young and the college students now think alike. An earlier survey in the late 1960 days of student disruptions showed that there was no "generation gap," that upper-middle-class white students had very little disagreement with their parents. The same thing was true among the blue-collar population and the working population -- there wasn't very much difference between the hard-hats and their mothers and fathers. While there was no generation gap, he found there was a difference based on class and to some extent ethnic backgrounds.

Now his new survey shows that the difference between classes has practically evaporated and is no longer statistically significant. It isn't just a Scarsdale Maoist, it isn't just the upper-middle-class comfortable folk, it is now the non-college workers, the union members, who share the same values as the college kids. And while one can't make too many generalizations on the basis of hair length, just take a look at your local policemen -- just take a look at the workers in the local assembly line -- and see if you can detect a difference in dress, manner, aspirations, from those in college.

That means that we're going to have to create institutions where people can feel the possibility to grow and to continue learning,



I know that many have had the experience of listening to some outside counsellor or consultant who in five minutes can have you saying, "My God, what wisdom!" about some question so perfectly obvious that none of the insiders had thought of it. Just as fish are the last to discover water, all of us need that sense of perspective and detachment. All of us are capable of having the same fresh insights that highly paid consultants have - if only we could find the historical distance to achieve an outsider's new perspective.

Furthermore, a manager at whatever level must be a social architect, vitally concerned with the environment of work, with what the social scientists call the "culture" of work - those things that are hard to discern, impossible to touch, but so terribly important for the way people act; that is, the set of values which guide our decision-making and our behavior.

Illustrations of culture can be observed in terms of their effects. For example, in some companies there is a norm or belief or value system which, overtly or tacitly, tends to reduce risk taking, tends to make people check things out fifteen times, tends to have executives keep what Chris Argyris refers to as JIC files - "just in case" the boss calls you and asks for some piece of information for which you keep years and years of outdated files. The culture can be observed in terms of the kinds of relationships that exist among people.

How close can you become to other people? What are the norms and rules regarding intimacy, distance, between people? How much control, independence, are people allowed? How much support do people give each other?

Lots of things go into producing a culture - the style of leadership, the particular technology of the institution, its peculiar history, and so on. The leader must understand the social architecture and climate within which he works and the culture

36

things in government policy that actually did them the most good and backed the things that actually would hurt them, it is largely because of this insular parochialism and lack of good information at the margins.

This danger emphasizes what I consider to be the main value and importance of a periodic "time out" moratorium for executives. M.I.T.'s Sloan School of Management and the Harvard Business School provide this for mid-management executives who can cross-fertilize their latent creative instincts by swapping experiences with opposite numbers, and above all simply gain the time and perspective for an intellectual "repotting." The Sloan Fellows used to say after their year at M.I.T. that they learned a lot about computer sciences, about industrial dynamics, and the human side of enterprise. However, as one who watched them, it seemed to me that their greatest gain was not from the areas of course work (although indeed they did get a lot from that). It was simply the fact that they and their families had a year away from it all, with other executives in similar positions, and by so doing gained a new perspective, a detachment. The German word for retreat means literally to take one step backwards, which also has a double meaning of gaining perspective, so as not to be, as Gertrude Stein said, "too immediate to be immediate."

Unfortunately our institutions really don't have these reflective structures built in where we can take the time to examine very seriously our own operations. And because we don't we are overloaded, too reactive to sheer, immediate events, and in consequence we often cannot ask the big questions, the most profound questions, about where we really are and where we should be headed. And I don't mean "long-range planning," something that is usually centralized and isolated and insulated in a "long-range planning office." I do mean the fundamental questions -- the very purposes of the institution. Presidents don't do it enough. Managers don't do it. Boards of directors should do it, but are equally remiss.

up the hierarchical ladder, which includes a period of their lives where they are themselves enclosed by the norms and the beliefs and the values of the middle management. They work themselves up. When they get to the top, a whole new array of forces – environmental, political, economic, financial, things they had never considered – confront them. For example, the people who come up through the financial end of institutions are bookkeepers. They move up through that hierarchy – tight control methods, bookkeeping, security, management controls – but at the very top, the vice-president of finance is really involved in legitimate gambling and risk-taking and nothing in his previous experience as a bookkeeper or a steward over other people's accounts is in any way preparation for that role at the top level.

Quite often people get to the top who are really unprepared for those jobs.

Organizations should be transitive; that is, being in job A should prepare you for job B, being in job B should prepare you for job C. Often organizations tend to keep people in particular jobs too long simply to over learn the competencies in job B before they get into job C. In the case of the financial, bookkeeping, trajectory, we see an organization and a career line being non-transitive. I suspect this is really the core reason for the so-called Peter Principle of people being promoted to their ultimate level of incompetency. It isn't that people just get lazy and obsolete. The fact is that they can be in a job and get promoted to another job where there is absolutely no preparation, no training, no background. So we have unprepared people in a highly turbulent environment. This also often leads to businesses opting for policies, governmental policies, that will be to their disadvantage and at other times fighting policies which would be to their advantage.

We have seen this a lot. Ted Levitt, in the Harvard Business Review, documents this. If by-and-large business has fought the

34

formed. One way of getting at this is to identify and utilize individuals whom I call "marginal," people who sense discrepancy or variance between the achievements of the organization and the aspirations, people who have the future in their bones, people who sense (without low-level grumbling and bellyaching) dissatisfaction and who want to achieve more. These are marginal people because their lives, contacts and interests often keep them at the margins or the boundary of the institution itself and the bigger outside world. They can, and should be, invaluable to a wise and prudent leader. The irony and tragedy is that they are all too often too marginal and hence, because the bad news they sometimes bring, or the variant news, may be at an angle to the conventional wisdom of the culture of the organization, they get their heads chopped off.

The bigger the bureaucracy, the greater its danger of a kind of incestuous, inward-dwellingness where middle management spends all its time writing self-justifying, self-protective memos to each other, and as far as the outside world is concerned, scarcely know whether it is raining or whether it is Thursday. The epitome of this came when the then head of General Motors, appearing before a Senate committee with all his retinue of advisors, was totally unprepared to discuss questions of automotive safety because, the wonder of it, he was totally unaware the Senators would raise those questions! In Brussels, while attending a World Conference of Planning, I stopped off to talk with some Unilever executives. That company seems to be aware of this middle management tone deafness. They figure that at the top or at the boundaries of the institution there is more opportunity for a potential leader to become more aware, more cosmopolitan, more involved with the forces around the boundaries of the organization. In a firm producing consumer products, it is of pivotal importance to have that kind of information.

One of the consequences of the middle management corseting and insularity is that too many people spend a long time going

We live in an information economy. Information itself is one of the chief levers of power (it was also the chief target of the White House "plumbers"). In large part organizations are information processing systems, and the people who get power are the ones who learn how to filter the incredible flow of information into a meaningful pattern. So one of the leader's biggest problems is to make sure that he gets all the valid information he needs and makes sure, difficult as it is, that that data and information have not been distorted by over-eager Doppelgangers who think they are presenting material to suit what they consider to be his prejudices or hunches.

Not long ago, a No. 3 man of one of our very largest corporations -- he had risen up this organization through the control and interpretation of data -- told me in a burst of candor that he had spent virtually all the previous ten years proving his boss right even when he was wrong. Now that was a family dynasty, so it should be no guide to others; but my own experience has taught me that the biggest problem of any executive is getting the truth.

As an advisor to the Department of State some years ago I learned that people got entrapped in a very misleading information flow where people reported to others what they thought the others wanted to hear or what they thought the others believed, themselves believing the opposite; this was true at every level of the hierarchy. It created at times policy which indeed nobody was in favor of, but everybody else thought that everybody else was. Like the couple who goes to a movie because the husband thinks his wife wants to, and the wife thinks he wants to, neither actually wants to, but both go.

What this boils down to is that the man at the top must develop a process where he not only gets the right information but also must have at his disposal a system that can with impunity question the assumptions which may be prematurely or even wrongly

32

The leader, at every level, must be partly a conceptualist, something more than just an "idea man." It means someone with a kind of an entrepreneurial vision, a sense of perspective, and most of all, the time to spend thinking about the forces that will affect the destiny of that person's shop or that institution. A story comes to mind. A king returned to his capital, followed by his victorious army. The band played and his horse, the army, the people all moved in step with the rhythm. The king, amazed, contemplated the power of music. Suddenly he noticed a man who walked out of step and slowly fell behind. The king, deeply impressed, sent for the man and told him, "I never saw a man as strong as you are. The music enthralled everybody except you. Where do you get the strength to resist it?" The man answered, "I was pondering, and that gave me the strength." That old story is relevant to the point I want to make. Almost all leaders complain about getting involved or overly involved in routine (turning off the lights, the day-to-day operations) and given the overload on all of us, it's understandable. But I don't think this is any excuse for not realizing that one of the main functions of every leader, every manager, is his sense of perspective to be a conceptualist, to be able to look ahead so that an organization or part of that organization can make the right decisions for the future, to be able to ask the right questions. It has been said so often that generals are always fighting the last war. That is not just true of the army.

The leader must create for his institution clear-cut and measurable goals, based on advice from all elements and many elements. He must be allowed to proceed toward those goals without being crippled by bureaucratic machinery and routine that sap his strength, energy and initiative. He must be allowed to take risks, to embrace error, to use his creativity to the hilt, and encourage others in the institution to use theirs. This cannot be done without the leader taking on a role of studied detachment, or a "time out" moratorium at times, or developing some "reflective" structure where he can ponder where strength can be gained and how the institutional goals can become vital and adaptive.



### How Managers Can Lead

The first requirement is that leaders at every level must lead, not just manage. The crisis calls for leadership; but leaders aren't leading. They're consulting, pleading, trotting, temporizing, putting out fires, either avoiding or more often taking too much heat, and spending too much energy in doing both. They've got sweaty palms, and they're scared.

I believe that any manager's first priority, the sine qua non of effective leadership, is to create around him some kind of executive team, a constellation, to help direct and run the office of the leader. It can be a mixed bag -- some of them vice presidents, some of them people on temporary duty, some presidential assistants. All of them must be compatible in the sense that they can work together, but neither uniform nor conformist in the sense of "yes men."

They will be men and women who know more, should know more, than the chief executive does about everything within their areas of competency and can attend to them without dropping their wet babies on his desk. They must be people who take very seriously the functions of the office, whether it's president, vice-president, foreman, middle management, or what. You can have an interesting, easy, group exercise which goes like this. We try, on one axis of a blackboard, to identify what that office must, should, do -- what its goals, tasks, objectives are, both short-term and long-run. And then we ask each individual what it is that he or she wants to do, are motivated to do, aspire to do. And then, finally, we look at competence. How competent are various individuals to perform those tasks. What I strive for, but never fully succeed in doing, is creating a fit, a triangulation, between competence or capacity, aspiration, what one wants to do, and what needs doing in that particular job.

30

notion of "one-man" leadership has to be seriously questioned. I would wager that we will see more and more collective leadership, in all institutions. I would forecast that President Ford will be working much more in tandem and more closely in an executive framework with his new Vice-President, Nelson Rockefeller, than have previous Presidents, because of the recognition of the managerial complexities of running such a huge establishment as our federal government. It is significant that Ford has already turned over to Rockefeller deputies the Domestic Council powers previously held by Nixon's close aide, Ehrlichman.

Such changes will lead to a lot of frustration about who's on the team and who isn't, who's in charge and who isn't. The name of the game will be ambiguity, and people had damn well better get used to it and learn to cope with it. There will be more politicization, new kinds of politics, new organizational politics. There will be more constituencies, more voices, more concerns, more caucuses, more regulations, more capricious and unpredictable litigation, and so on. And there will be -- is already -- a blurring of the traditional line between public and private sectors. There will be elements of each in the other.

These are the kinds of characteristics of the organizations we are now living in. My own view is that these tendencies will become more pronounced, more visible, in the years ahead, and that it is incumbent upon all of us and all those who aspire to positions of responsibility to understand them, to cope with them, and to learn how to be masters of our own fate in a wholly different kind of organizational environment. All this augurs more frustration for the followers as well as the leaders, and certainly makes it more mandatory than ever before for better, deeper understanding between the leaders and the led. Else neither will be leading nor being led.

Therefore, we can expect that decision-making will become an increasingly intricate process of multi-lateral brokerage, a brokerage that will include both people within the organization and outside the organization. And more and more, these decisions will be public in the sense that they affect people who intend to be heard, especially if a decision doesn't suit them. So more and more constituencies will be involved in voicing their opinions. Management will have to take into account constituencies that they would never before have had to consider except through some market research.

Moreover, today's leader must consider the growing role of the media as the fourth estate -- the fourth arm of government. The media will be used both by those who favor, but even more so by people who oppose, particular decisions being made. The decisions involved will affect more and more people. A product cannot be distributed in many of the retail areas unless various consumer groups and organizations are consulted. Public sector examples of this are the decisions that administrators must make on mass transit, on pollution, whether to build fewer highways or more railways. The fact is that the concept of "movers and shakers" -- a clearly defined elite who determine the major decisions -- is an outdated notion. They are as much the shaken -- the "shook" -- as the shakers.

The bigger the problem to be tackled, the more power will be diffused, and the more people will exercise it. Decisions are increasingly complex and specialized and affect more, and different kinds of, constituencies.

We're moving toward what the Russians call "collective leadership." We already see analogies of this in some of our most successful corporate institutions -- Union Carbide for example -- where executive constellations, or task forces, are created for specific purposes. When all large institutions have, according to Peter Drucker, at least forty-five core functions or goals, the

28

disciples outside the churches than in them. The thousands turning to inward-dwelling mysticism make their own dreams in the dreamless society.

There is, above all, a hunger for both that integrity and simplicity which mark the truly great -- a Lincoln, an Einstein, a Holmes, a Schweitzer.

The irony and paradox of our times is that precisely when the trust and credibility of leaders is at its lowest, when we survivors in leadership positions feel inhibited from exercising what little power we have, it is a time when we most need people who can lead, who can transcend that vacuum.

Unless we can transcend it, it seems to me that we are in great danger, that a wave of violent crime, of organizational paralysis -- a failure of nerve -- could easily lead bitter and fearful citizens to seek a demagogue on horseback.

Within this gloomy perspective, let's examine the requirements of genuine leadership in such a complex and confusing era. Harlan Cleveland, rewording Wilson, calls today's large organizations "a jungle of close decisions openly arrived at." That's a valid description. The organization of today is big, complex and surrounded by an active, incessant environment which is becoming more influential and dominant in the kinds of decisions that affect the institution. In a sense organizations have a difficult time just as individuals do in becoming self-determining.

But institutions are going to become bigger and more complex, more inclusive than ever before. This may sadden both the reactionary and the radical who are nostalgic for the "ma-and-pa" corner grocery or the one-room schoolhouse. But the power and pervasiveness of new technologies will require more complex systems, more expensive systems and more specialists involved in decision-making.

mastery in times of rapid change. Many institution leaders do not want to face up to this. Not long ago, the Director of the New York Health Corporation resigned and said, "I already see indications of the corporation and its cause being made a political football in the current campaign. I'm not a politician. I do not wish to become involved in the political issues here." And yet in a previous article he said that he found himself, "at the center of a series of ferocious struggles for money, power and jobs among the combatants, political leaders, labor leaders, minority groups, medical militants, medical school deans, doctors and nurses and many of his own administrative subordinates." His corporation has an \$800 million budget and is responsible for capital construction of more than \$1 billion, employs 40,000 people, including 7,500 doctors and almost 15,000 nurses and nurses aides. It embraces 19 hospitals with 15,000 beds and numerous out-patient clinics and emergency rooms that treat 2,000,000 New Yorkers a year. And he's surprised that he's into politics -- and doesn't like it!

When our own university could admit only 187 medical school applicants out of 8,000, we immediately angered some 23,000 would-be constituents -- 24,000 parents and applicants minus the successful applicants and their parents who were pleased. Those who were unhappy immediately brought pressure on councilmen and legislators. What resulted were proposals to legislate restrictions on our autonomy, such as to bar out-of-state students. We could resent and oppose that, and we did; but we should not be surprised by it. We should know that such decisions automatically become political.

### The Shape of the Future

The great leaders are gone -- but, the people, particularly the young -- hunger for new ones. There is a spiritual thirst; God may be dead, but Jesus is very much alive -- he may have more

26

the incredible mass of paper stacked before me. I was bone weary and soul weary, and I found myself muttering, "Either I can't manage this place or it is unmanageable."

I reached for my calendar and ran my eye down each hour, each half-hour, quarter-hour, to see where my time had gone that day, the day before, the month before.

What I discovered was that I had become the victim of a vast, amorphous, unwitting, unconscious conspiracy to prevent me from doing anything whatever to change the university's status quo.

Even those of my associates who fully shared my hopes to set new goals, to work toward creative change, were unconsciously doing the most to ensure that I would never find the time to begin it.

In recent years I have talked to many new presidents of widely ranging enterprises. Almost every one told me that the biggest mistake he made was to take on too much, as if "proving oneself" depended on providing instant solutions, and success was dependent on immediate achievements. These instant solutions often led to pseudo-solutions for problems not fully analyzed. People follow the old army game. They do not want to take the responsibility or bear the consequences of decisions that they should properly make. Everyone dumps his "wet babies" (as the State Department old hands called them) on my desk when I have neither the diapers nor the information to take care of them.

Today's leader is often baffled or frustrated by a new kind of politics, not along traditional party lines, but arising from significant interaction with various governmental agencies, regulations, the courts, the media, the consumers and so on. It is the politics of maintaining institutional "self-directedness" and



The people who are joining our organizations and institutions today are those who seek, who represent, the latter part of each of those dichotomies. They are the "New Culture."

So there are the problems of leadership today. We have a new and important emergence of a Roosevelt-Keynes revolution, new politics, new dependencies, new constituencies, new values. The consequence of these pressures is a loss of autonomy of the institution to determine its own destiny.

### Why Leaders Don't Lead

Why are the "leaders" not leading?

One reason, I fear, is that many of us don't have the faintest concept of what leadership is all about. Leading does not mean managing; the difference between the two is crucial. There are many institutions I know that are very well managed and very poorly led. They may excel in the ability to handle each day all the routine inputs yet may never ask whether the routine should be done at all.

I've noted myself that frequently my most enthusiastic deputies were unwittingly keeping me from working any fundamental change in the institution. I think all of us find that acting on routine problems because they are the easiest things to do often blocks us from getting involved in the bigger ones.

This brings me to what I might call "Bennis' First Law of Pseudodynamics," which is that routine work will always drive out the innovational. My own moment of truth came toward the end of my first ten months as head of the university.

It was one of those nights in the office. The clock was moving toward three in the morning, and I was still not through with

24

It obviously changes every aspect of information sharing and the way recommendations are written about students.

Leaders become an endangered species because the external forces and the internal constituents, themselves with diverse expectations and demands and desires, isolate the man at the top as the sole "boundary" person trying somehow to negotiate between them. There is growing tension, conflict, goal divergence, between the internal and external demands. In my own city a Kroger's or a P&G must consider both external as well as internal problems, whether nitrates or price-labeling. Or take the effects of "affirmative action" on what used to be autonomous decisions made by the organization. The overload of these demands from within and without the institution is enormous.

Within the community, we have not only a loss of consensus over basic values, we have as well a polarization. We have not a consensus but a dissensus.

Consider the change of values among the young, as reflected in the surveys done recently by Yankelovich. We've gone from the considerations of quantity, that is more, toward considerations of quality, that is better. The old culture would focus on the concept of independence, whereas the new culture moves toward the concept of interdependence of nations, institutions, individuals, all natural species. What they are saying here is that we want a new "declaration of interdependence." From conquest of nature toward living in harmony with it, from competition toward cooperation, from doing and planning toward being, from the primacy of technology toward considerations of social justice and equity, from the dictates of organizational convenience toward the aspirations of self-realization and learning, from authoritarianism and dogmatism toward more participation, from uniformity and centralization toward diversity and pluralism, from the concept of work as hard, unavoidable -- from life as "nasty, brutish and short" -- toward work as purpose and self-fulfillment, a recognition of leisure as a valid activity in itself.

of welfare, social service and education that the private sector was unwilling or unable to handle. As Lord Keynes wrote: "Progress lies in the growth and the recognition of semi-autonomous bodies within the states. Large business corporations, when they have reached a certain age and size, approximate the status of public corporations rather than that of the individualistic private enterprise." The Keynesian prophesy is upon us. When David Rockefeller goes to London, he is greeted as if he were a chief of state (and some of his empires are bigger than many states). But in addition to the Keynesian prophesy about the semi-autonomous, often global, corporations which rival governments, we also have public-sector institutions which Keynes could scarcely have imagined. The largest employment sector of our society, which is growing at the fastest rate, is local and state government. Higher education, which less than twenty years ago was 50 percent private, 50 percent public, is now about 85 percent public and is expected to be 90 percent public by 1980.

And, where a century ago 90 percent of all Americans were self-employed, today 90 percent now work in what can be called bureaucracies, members of some kind of corporate family. They might be called "juristic" persons who work within the sovereignty of a legal entity called a corporation or bureaucracy. Juristic persons who do not control their own actions cannot place the same faith in each other that self-employed persons did.

And along with the growth of public-sector institutions, we have seen it handmaiden -- a catscradle of regulations which tend to restrict or reduce the institution's autonomy in decision-making. What we now have is a situation where many of the decisions being made by any major organization, public or private, have to do with factors that are partly outside the control, and definitely outside the governing perimeter, of the organization itself.

To take just one example -- the university -- the Buckley Amendment makes all records available to students and parents.

Another tactic often used by a type of organizational leader that we have occasionally seen glorified in movies and novels has to do with pitting two or more deputies in a kind of gladiatorial mortal combat. I have heard executives say, "Well, I'm just going to see what old Joe and old Bill do to one another for the next year or two," which is I suppose a form of legitimate genocide. I cannot think of many situations where that would be an effective way of dealing with differences and conflicts.

All too infrequently do executives try to make conflict creative, look on conflicts and differences with managerial objectivity and as an educational opportunity. I see a segment of any manager's, and leader's, role as being educational. Quite often we can learn from differences, not just learn the other's point of view; but almost always, if we really analyze differences and conflict, doing so will identify a significant problem that that organization has not yet learned how to handle.

How do we convert conflict and differences into the potentials of better problem solving? We must welcome the existence of differences because they are going to be there whether we like it or not. We must try to create approaches where we can learn from them.

What can a leader do? Here is a checklist.

He can listen with understanding, rather than evaluation. Quite often people who hold conflicting points of view believe that no one really understands them or is in tune with them. There is tremendous difference between understanding and agreement, although sometimes the difference is hard for subordinates to grasp. As a first step, we need to get a better idea of what is on people's minds and do our best to see it from their points of view before saying "that's bad" or "that's good" or the horror of it or the wonder of it.

Secondly, a leader must try to clarify the nature of the conflict. Quite often there is a lot of confusion or obfuscation as to its true nature. On occasion, deep understanding and clarification of the real issue can resolve it. You can also recognize and accept the feelings of the individuals involved rather than saying, "Oh, boys shouldn't fight" or implicitly or openly rebuking those involved in the controversy. A lot of evidence shows that when people are involved in conflict -- feel threatened or under attack -- they tend to become more rigid and more defensive about positions. What the leader can help to do is lower the defensive syndrome. He can also try to make things clearer and better by indicating who is in control or who will make the final decision about the controversy being discussed. Sometimes I've seen disputes go on with respect to an issue over which the persons involved had no control. So it may be wise to make clear what the actual realities of that situation are.

The leader can also suggest procedures and ground rules for resolving the differences. If the disagreement is over facts, the leader may assist various disputants in validating data or seeking additional data. If it's over methods, he may want to remind the parties that they have common objectives. If the disagreement is over goals or goal priorities, he may suggest that the parties take time to describe as clearly as possible the conflicting goals which are being sought, rather than the vague terms sometimes used in conflict. Disagreement over values is trickier, more difficult, but even these can be useful to clarify the actual differences and to make people more fully aware of what the others' points of view are.

The leader should give a lot of attention to maintaining relationships between the disputing parties. Often during the course of heated argument, so much attention is paid to the issue under discussion that nothing is done to maintain and strengthen the relationship between the parties. The leader has a maintenance role here that he should realize and try to establish. If a conflict

is to be transformed into a problem-solving situation, these functions need to be performed by someone, if necessary by a third party, but preferably by the leader.

The leader can also set up appropriate vehicles for communication among the disputing parties. Here is where creativity comes into play. Techniques that have proved useful include brainstorming, a select committee, a third-party intervention from an uninvolved outside source, or a retreat, away from the scene of conflict, where "leveling" is encouraged for all concerned. All of these have to do with the leader playing, at every level, a crucial role in helping to clarify and to cope with the inevitable conflict that exists and to try to divert that into constructive channels.

All of this is based on the assumption of managerial objectivity, of perspective and judgment. The people reporting to the manager each have their own blind spots, particular areas, vested interests, orientations, based on role and perceptions. Somehow or other the manager has to have this ecumenical view and the objectivity that should go with it.

It's interesting to ask, "Just what is it that leaders in fact do at the present time?" without putting any evaluation on it. That is, what do we know descriptively about the behavior of leaders? Only recently a study was done by Mintzberg to try to categorize the behavioral patterns of leaders.

He found eight areas of prime importance:

1. Peer skills -- the ability to establish and maintain a network of contacts with equals.
2. Leadership skills -- the ability to deal with subordinates and the kind of complications of power, authority and dependence.



3. Conflict-resolution skills -- the ability to mediate conflict, to handle disturbances under psychological stress.
4. Information-processing skills -- the ability to build networks, extract and validate information, and disseminate information effectively.
5. Skills in unstructured decision-making -- the ability to find problems and solutions when alternatives, information and objectives are ambiguous.
6. Resource-allocation skills -- the ability to decide among alternative uses of time and other scarce organizational resources.
7. Entrepreneurial skills -- the ability to take sensible risks and implement innovations.
8. Skills of introspection -- the ability to understand the position of a leader and his impact on the organization.

I think that is a splendid list. From my own experience as a leader, and from talking with other executives, and observing as a consultant other leaders at work, these pretty much summarize the basic skills that leaders need.

But there's more than that -- an "X" factor that is hard to define but is quintessential for leadership. Leaders have to define issues, not aggravate the problems. They have to clarify the problems, not exploit them. In effect, leaders are essentially educators. Our great political leaders, such as Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, were essentially educators who tried to educate the people about both the problems and the deeper underlying issues. They also developed solutions.

A leader who responds to a drought by attacking the lack of rainfall is not likely to inspire a great deal of confidence. And

what we see quite often is the problem being left as a problem rather than getting to the underlying issue and a possible solution. Martin Luther King, Jr., provided this perspective, inside illumination, and understanding for the Black people of this country. We sorely need leadership that can do this for our entire nation. Lyndon Johnson once said, "Get your head above the grass." And in the same farmyard language someone else said that any rooster that sticks his head up above the grass will get a rock thrown at it. That's true, but that's exactly where a leader's head belongs.

John Gardner said that the best kept secret in America today is the need of people to believe and to dedicate themselves to purposes that are worthy and that are bigger than themselves. I am certain that the need to believe, fidelity to an idea, an ideal, is necessary for our mental health. Erik Erikson, the distinguished psychiatrist, suggests that maturity cannot be reached until there is some form of fidelity to an ideal, a value, a belief. The good leader understands and develops ideas and issues that resonate with this need to believe, this need to dedicate oneself, this need to give something to a cause greater than oneself. The Peace Corps tapped that need - and we saw remarkable people, young and old, flock to the doors to work for it. We need, in Frost's lapidary phrase, "work and play for mortal stakes."

The leader must also recognize imperfection and at the same time retain a sense of optimism and of hope.

A study done of the effective psychotherapist showed that the particular orientation or school from which a therapist comes has little to do with his effectiveness. The common chord among successful therapists had to do with whether they had hope in the ability to solve a problem, in the ability to help someone.

Similarly, a study was done on school teachers, and it turned out that when school teachers held high expectations for their

48

students, that that alone was sufficient to cause an increase of twenty-five points in the I.Q. scores of the students. Where the teachers seemed to have low expectations or hopes, the scores had no significant difference.

What qualities do these challenges demand from new leaders?

After at least fifty years of research and theorizing we can say only one thing with any confidence: there are no provable generalizations about leadership.

That indefinable quality of charisma is sometimes mentioned. But there are charismatic people who do not become leaders, and there are non-charismatic people who do -- Herbert Hoover, Clement Atlee, Golda Meir come to mind.

There are low-energy leaders and high-energy leaders. There are attractive and unattractive leaders. But all the accumulated research in personal psychology suggests there is not one single trait or characteristic that would have any value in predicting leadership potentialities. None -- not even intelligence.

It seems to me the big test for any new leader will be whether or not he can -- by identifying with the process of change -- ride or even direct it, and by so doing, build new strengths in the process. By identifying with change he will find himself changing, growing.

An old Talmudic story comes to mind. An oriental king, who had heard that Moses was a leader, kindly, generous and bold, had a portrait of Moses brought to him, and examined it with his astrologers and phrenologists. When they examined it carefully, they told the king that Moses was a cruel, greedy, craven, self-seeking man. Puzzled by this the king went to visit Moses. On meeting him, he saw that the portrait was good, and said, "My phrenologists and astrologers were wrong." But Moses

disagre  
saw wi  
that I

The le  
himse

The  
first  
pow  
the  
autho

Power  
showe  
The  
wantin  
endang

disagreed: "Your phrenologists and astrologers were right, they saw what I was made of; but what they couldn't tell you was that I struggled against all that and so became what I am."

The leader who does learn to "cope," to direct change, may find himself or herself quite a different person five years hence.

The task of the leader is to lead. And to lead others he must first of all know himself. His ultimate test is the wise use of power. As Sophocles says in *Antigone*: "But it is hard to learn the mind of any mortal, or the heart, till he be tried in chief authority. Power shows the man."

Power, leadership, authority have very recently all too clearly shown the man, the men, who could not use it wisely or properly. The landscape is littered with those who were tried and found wanting. It is for us to profit from their example, so that the endangered species may survive.